

**Remarks:**

The above amendments and these remarks are responsive to the Office action dated October 31, 2005.

Prior to entry of this Amendment, claims 1-25 remained pending in the present application. All claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Gecht et al. (US 6,859,832). Applicants respectfully disagree, but have cancelled claims 2, 5 and 6, and have amended claims 1 and 15-17 to make the claimed subject matter more clear.

In view of the foregoing amendments, and the remarks below, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 and allowance of the pending claims.

**Rejections under 35 USC § 102**

As noted above, claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Gecht et al. (US 6,859,832).

Gecht et al. discloses methods and systems for providing printing services over a communications network. The indicated systems employ a printer polling device capable of polling a spooling server to determine whether any print jobs associated with the printer polling device are available for printing at an associated printer.

In one embodiment, the user enters a personal identification number (PIN) at a client device. The PIN is then forwarded to the spooling server, along with a print job. Thereafter, the user again enters the PIN at the printer polling device, and if the PIN is proper, the print job is sent to a printer associated with the printer polling device.

Page 6 - AMENDMENT  
Serial No. 10/074,793  
HP Docket No. 10016811-1  
KH Docket No. HPCB 371

Gecht et al. does not disclose or suggest that the client device retrieves the PIN from another network device. Gecht et al. merely allows a user to enter a PIN at a client device requesting a print job, and again at the printer on which the print job is to be printed (via the printer polling device). The spooling server passes the print job on to the printer if the PIN entered at the client device matches the PIN entered at the printer. The spooling server does not direct authorization of the user by providing an authorization code. Control remains with the user at all times.

As amended, claim 1 recites:

A method comprising:  
retrieving an authorization code from a remote monitoring device;  
sending a print job with the authorization code to the remote monitoring device;  
the remote monitoring device checking whether the authorization code is valid;  
enabling printing of the print job upon determining that the authorization code is valid; and  
disabling printing of the print job upon determining that the authorization code is invalid.

Gecht et al. does not disclose "retrieving an authorization code from a remote monitoring device". According to Gecht et al., the user enters a PIN at the client device, and again at the printer when printing is to occur. The PIN is never retrieved from the spooling server, or any other network device. Accordingly, there is no remote monitoring device in Gecht et al.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by Gecht et al., and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Gecht et al. must be withdrawn. Correspondingly, inasmuch as claims 3, 4 and 7 depend from claim 1, such claims are distinguishable from Gecht et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 1. The rejection of claims 3, 4 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Gecht et al. thus also must be withdrawn.

Page 7 - AMENDMENT  
Serial No. 10/074,793  
HP Docket No. 10016811-1  
KH Docket No. HPCB 371

Claim 8 recites:

In a public computer service center where multiple computers can be connected to a communications link associated with the service center, a method comprising:

- creating a request to log on to the communications link;
- retrieving an authorization code from a host located on the communications link;
- sending a print job to a printer with the authorization code embedded in a header of the print job; and
- checking whether the authorization code is valid, prior to enabling or disabling the print job from printing.

As noted generally with respect to claim 1, Gecht et al. does not disclose or suggest "retrieving an authorization code from a host located on the communications link." Gecht et al. discloses nothing more than providing for user input of a PIN that may be used to encrypt data sent to a spooling server. There is no ability of the host to control authentication of a print job.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 8 is not anticipated by Gecht et al., and the rejection of claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Gecht et al. must be withdrawn. Correspondingly, inasmuch as claims 9-14 depend from claim 8, such claims are distinguishable from Gecht et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 8. The rejection of claims 9-14 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Gecht et al. thus also must be withdrawn.

Furthermore, with respect to claim 12, applicants note that Gecht et al. does not disclose or suggest an authorization code containing "a quality of service parameter." With respect to claim 13, applicants note that Gecht et al. does not disclose or suggest an agent that "retrieves the authorization code from the host and assigns the authorization code to the print job." In fact, Gecht et al. does not even disclose an agent operating on the client device. Claims 12 and 13 thus are allowable over Gecht et al. for these additional reasons.

Page 8 - AMENDMENT  
Serial No. 10/074,793  
HP Docket No. 10016811-1  
KH Docket No. HPCB 371

Amended claim 15 recites:

A system comprising:  
a communications link;  
a monitoring device attached to the communications link; and  
an agent, configured to provide an interface between a computer and the communications link, wherein the agent receives an authorization code from the monitoring device, and assigns the authorization code to a print job sent by the computer,  
wherein the monitoring device is configured to receive the print job and verify whether the authorization code is valid.

Gecht et al. does not disclose or suggest "an agent, configured to provide an interface between a computer and the communications link; wherein the agent receives an authorization code from the monitoring device, and assigns the authorization code to a print job sent by the computer." In fact, Gecht et al. does not even disclose an agent configured to provide an interface between a computer and a communications link.

Gecht et al. discloses nothing more than a user-input PIN. Claim 15 specifically recites an agent that "receives an authorization code from the monitoring device" and "assigns the authorization code to a print job sent by the computer." Gecht et al. thus does not provide for authorization of a print job by a remote monitoring device. Gecht et al. only allows a user to verify that he/she is the user that sent the print job.

For at least the foregoing reasons, claim 15 is not anticipated by Gecht et al., and the rejection of claim 15 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Gecht et al. must be withdrawn. Correspondingly, inasmuch as claims 16-25 depend from claim 15, such claims are distinguishable from Gecht et al. for at least the same reasons as claim 15. The rejection of claims 16-25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Gecht et al. thus also must be withdrawn.

Page 9 - AMENDMENT  
Serial No. 10/074,793  
HP Docket No. 10016811-1  
KH Docket No. HPCB 371

**Conclusion**

Applicants believe that this application is now in condition for allowance, in view of the above amendments and remarks. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowability covering the pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, or if a telephone interview would in any way advance prosecution of the application, please contact the undersigned attorney of record.

Respectfully submitted,

KOLISCH HARTWELL, P.C.



---

Walter W. Karnstein  
Registration No. 35,565  
520 S.W. Yamhill Street, Suite 200  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Telephone: (503) 224-6655  
Facsimile: (503) 295-6679  
Attorney for Applicants

**CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to Examiner J. Pokrzywa, Group Art Unit 2622, Assistant Commissioner for Patents, at facsimile number (571) 273-8300 on January 31, 2006.



---

Christie A. Doolittle

Page 10 - AMENDMENT  
Serial No. 10/074,793  
HP Docket No. 10016811-1  
KH Docket No. HPCB 371